

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Rejection mailed May 1, 2007.
Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Entry of this amendment is solicited because Applicants had no previous opportunity to respond to the new art reference and arguments primarily relied upon in the May 1 Action. Applicants believe the amended claims and remarks are fully responsive to the new issues raised in the May 1 Action and clarify the previously submitted claims to place this application in condition for allowance, or at least in better condition for appeal.

Claims

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12, 15, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the newly cited U.S. Pat. App. 2002/0078447 of Mizutome et al. ("Mizutome").
This rejection is traversed.

Mizutome teaches a system for managing the presentation of displayed data, using past user settings to automatically determine default current settings, such as layout and audio configuration. (Mizutome, paragraphs 0081, 0084-0094, 0097-0098). The apparatus of Mizutome stores viewer preferences associated with metadata of content in a configuration database. (Mizutome, paragraph 0094). If new content is displayed that has the same metadata as a stored configuration, the stored preferences will be applied. (Mizutome, paragraph 0098). While Mizutome may teach a type of display system that displays information from multiple content sources simultaneously, it fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in Applicants' claims.

With regard to claim 1, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited therein. For example, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest "[a] display device . . . wherein, when the display control unit detects an event based upon the content of a predetermined display information displayed in a predetermined area, the display control unit controls said display unit

to present the occurrence of the event to the user.” The previously-submitted version of claim 1 recited the detection of an event “corresponding to a predetermined display information displayed in a predetermined area.” In light of the examples in Applicants’ specification of events that correspond to displayed information, such as responding to the appearance of a person in a displayed image (Applicants’ specification, paragraph 0017), or the volume of a displayed program exceeding a threshold (Applicants’ specification, paragraph 0014), Applicants believe the current scope of this claim was adequately expressed by the previous language. However, in the interests of furthering the prosecution of this application towards allowance, Applicants have clarified this claim to remove possible ambiguity concerning events “corresponding to” displayed information.

Mizutome may teach responding to events by altering the display to notify the user, based upon a history of user preferences for handling similar events. (e.g., Mizutome, paragraphs 0107, 0116-0117). However, the events taught and suggested by Mizutome are limited to reception of email, some predetermined timer event, or the initialization of a new input source. (Mizutome, paragraph 0107). None of these events are *detected* based upon the *content* of information displayed – rather, the events of Mizutome are *detected* based upon external events unrelated to displayed information. Therefore this claim is patentable over Mizutome for at least this reason. Furthermore, claims 2-16, which are dependent on claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations recited therein, are also patentable for at least this reason. Additionally, claims 17 and 18, which contain similar limitations reciting “detecting an event based upon the content of a predetermined display information displayed in a predetermined area,” are also patentable for at least similar reasons.

With regard to claim 4, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited therein. For example, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest “[a] display device . . . wherein, the setting unit sets information representing the priority of the display information . . . and wherein, the display control unit controls the display unit . . . based on the information representing the priority.” Mizutome teaches controlling the display based on configurations previously observed

by the display device. (Mizutome, paragraph 0098). However, this functionality is not comparable to setting the priority of the display information.

Priority, as described in Applicants' specification, creates a consistent ordering among the display categories and display targets. (See Applicants' specification, paragraphs 0086-0089 and Figs. 5-6). For example, as shown in Fig. 5, "TV Program" has a higher priority than "Traffic Information," and "Traffic Information" has a higher priority than "Weather Information." Because priority is an ordering, it exhibits transitivity, e.g., "TV Program" has a higher priority than "Weather Information."

$$[p(\text{Program}) > p(\text{Traffic})] \ \& \ [p(\text{Traffic}) > p(\text{Weather})] \ \rightarrow \ [p(\text{Program}) > p(\text{Weather})]$$

This relation allows the invention Applicants recited in claim 4 to predictably control the display of information among various combinations of information sources, even particular combinations that have not been explicitly set by the user. For example, with the priority arrangement shown in Fig. 5, "TV Program" will always have a higher priority (and, for example, be allocated a more prominent display area) than either "Traffic Information" or "Weather Information," regardless of whether either one, or both, of the latter two are also being displayed or have been displayed in the past.

The display configurations of Mizutome are based upon past viewer settings, but do not necessarily create a consistent priority ordering among information sources. For example, when viewing two sources with the Mizutome system, a viewer may at separate times allocate a more prominent viewing area to a news broadcast than weather information, a more prominent viewing area to weather information than a sporting event, and a more prominent viewing area to a sporting event than a news broadcast.

$$[a(\text{News}) > a(\text{Weather})] \ \& \ [a(\text{Weather}) > a(\text{Sports})] \ \& \ [a(\text{Sports}) > a(\text{News})]$$

Such viewing histories stored in the history database would not create an ordering among the three input sources. If all three inputs were viewed at once, the apparatus of Mizutome would have no means of determining which if any of these sources should be allocated a more prominent viewing area than the others. The user histories of Mizutome do not constitute a priority as described in Applicants' specification and recited in claim 4, therefore for at least this reason claim 4 is patentable over Mizutome.

With regard to claim 10, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited therein. For example, Mizutome fails to teach or suggest “[a] display device . . . wherein the display control unit controls said display unit to display a picture from a camera acquired through the Internet.” Mizutome may teach acquiring display information from a camera, (Mizutome, paragraph 0070), but the camera is taught as being connected locally to the device through a PCMCIA interface. Mizutome may teach acquiring data over the Internet through a modem, (Mizutome, 0087), however this information is described as “information regarding the Internet or E-mail,” (Mizutome, 0069). Mizutome does not teach acquiring picture data from a camera over the Internet for displaying on the display device. Therefore for at least this reason claim 4 is patentable over Mizutome.

In light of these considerations, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutome in view of U.S. Pat. App. 2002/0169893 to Chen et al. (“Chen”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed with regard to claim 1, Mizutome fails to teach detecting and responding to events based upon the content of displayed information, as incorporated into claim 5 by its dependence on claim 1. While Chen may add teachings regarding some form of linking display devices, it fails to teach detecting and responding to events based upon the content of displayed information. Therefore this claim is patentable over this combination for at least these reasons and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutome in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,303 to Klein et al. ("Klein"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed with regard to claim 1, Mizutome fails to teach detecting and responding to events based upon the content of displayed information, as incorporated into claims 7 and 11 by their dependence on claim 1. While Klein may teach detecting an increase in sound level, it is not a sound level in a displayed program, but rather the sound level detected from the environment using a microphone. (Klein, 2:54-58). Similarly, while Klein may suggest detecting motion or contrast changes indicative of an intruder, these features are not detected from displayed information, but rather the images captures from the environment using a video cameras. (Klein, 2:58-61). Therefore this combination does not teach or fairly suggest all of the features in claims 7 and 11.

Furthermore, the May 1 Action has not provided sufficient justification as to why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. The support recited in the May 1 Action, "the sound detection system security system has the ability of diagnosing the presence of an intruder and informing the police" is unrelated to both the Mizutome reference and Applicants' invention. It is unknown why one having skill in the art would seek to combine teachings regarding a home security system for detecting an intruder with art concerning how to efficiently display multiple sources of information simultaneously to a user.

For at least these reasons, claims 7 and 11 are patentable over these references and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutome in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,724,403 to Santoro et al. ("Santoro"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Santoro teaches another method of simultaneously presenting multiple sources of information to a user. (Santoro, Abstract). Santoro divides the available display area into a grid, and displays one source of information in each grid location. (Santoro, e.g. col. 6 lines 38-51 and Fig. 1). However, Santoro fails to teach or suggest the features recited in Applicants' claims.


Santoro may teach displaying Internet content and text documents in the display grid. However, these broad general terms do not support the obviousness of Applicants' specific claimed features, such as "information concerning the user's community" or "a to-do list." The art must teach some motivation to have selected the specific claimed features from the broad teachings of the references. This is especially true when the general categories of the prior art are of near infinite breadth, supposedly here including any type of document or Internet information. *See* MPEP § 2144.08: OBVIOUSNESS OF SPECIES WHEN PRIOR ART TEACHES GENUS, specifically § 2144.08(II)(A)(4). No motivation is shown in any of the cited references for displaying community information or a to-do list as the display information, therefore Applicants' claims 13 and 14 are patentable over these references for at least these reasons and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2831 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Ronald P. Kananen
Registration No.: 24,104
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 23353
Attorney for Applicant